Case 1:05-cv-11045-GAO
U.S. Department of Justice
United States Marshals Service

Document PROCESS RECEIPT AND RETURN

See Instructions for "Service of Process by the U.S. Marshal" on the reverse of this form.

PLAINTIFF	1	,	``				COURT CASE NUMB	BER	- 1 -
	1= U=	186	<u> ਲੋ ਕਾ</u>	<u> </u>			05-110	45-6	<u> 740</u>
DEFENDANT	,	١					TYPE OF PROCESS		
	MI	CHas		MALON	1EY. ET.	AL_	CIVEL >	ACTION	J
SERVE	NAME OF INI	DIVIDUAL, C	OMPANY,	CORPORATION	N, ETC., TO SERVE	OR DESCR	IPTION OF PROPERTY T	O SEIZE OR CO	NDEMN
	LT. ROPE	ET V	SHUZ	آد ^ک د	300				
- {	ADDRESS (S	treet or RFD,	Apartment	No., City, Stat	e and ZIP Code)			-	
AT	76 -	4 000		1	G	<u> </u>	رحلاحل		
	OF SERVICE COL	N TO BEOU	DESTRUCTION AT	HAME AND	ADDRESS BELOW:	74 (31707		
SEND NOTICE	OF SERVICE CO	ri io kego	ESTER AI	NAME AND A	ADDRESS BELOW:		er of process to be	,	
	ATCH-	35L '	D ~	~ ~		served	with this Form - 285		
٠,	MECE	1-312	17.00	HOFTS	7	Numbe	er of parties to be	T , _	
7	20	100°	J 470	O , 75,			in this case	112	
	11 V3	علمعناة	E. Λ\	(A)		· 			
		Coppe.	,	0/20	0010-1T		for service		
						on U.S	S.A.		
SPECIAL INSTR	RUCTIONS OR OT	THER INFOR	MATION T	HAT WILL AS	SIST IN EXPEDITIN	G SERVIC	E (Include Business and		sses, All
Telephone Number	ers, and Estimated	Times Availal	ole For Ser	vice):					Fold
	BUDY	078-	F-14	165	00		,	5	1 1313
, , ,	10 17 =	710	-	, – –			1	W BET	•
									,
								U ESE	3
								∵ بي	
								S in	
Signature of Attor	ney or other Origin	ator requesting	service on	behalf of:	-L	TELE	PHONE NUMBER	DATE	
^ ^ A	· -	\Rightarrow			PLAINTIFF	- 1			07
		-1-2-2			☐ DEFENDAN	<u> </u>			・レンへ
SPACE BI	ELOW FOR	USE O	F U.S.	MARSHA	L ONLY — D	O NO	WRITE BELO	OW THIS	LINE
I acknowledge rec	eint for the total	Total Process	District	District	Signature of Auth	orized USA	AS Deputy of Clerk	Dat	0
number of process	•	Total Trocoss	of Origin	to Serve	organical or 7 total	_			
(Sign only first than one USM 28	USM 285 if more	j	No. 32	No. 35	Marie	, <i>D</i> .	clause	8-	/3/05
						J			
							s shown in "Remarks", the		
on the individual,	company, corporati	on, etc., at the	address sh	own above or on	the individual, compa	iny, corpora	tion, etc., shown at the ad	dress inserted bel	ow.
I hereby certi	ify and return that	I am unable	to locate th	e individual, co	ompany, corporation,	etc., named	above (See remarks be	low)	
Name and title o	f individual served	(if not show	a abova)						
Name and title o	iiidividdai seived	t (ii not show.	above					suitable age and residing in the de	
							usual place		
Address (complete	e only if different th	an shown abou	e)				Date of Service	Time	am
								1	pm
							Signature of U.S	. Marshal or De	puty
Service Fee	Total Mileage Ch	arges Forwa	rding Fee	Total Charges	Advance Deposits	Amount of	owed to U.S. Marshal or	Amount of R	efund
	(including endea	vors)			-				
REMARKS:									

Case 1:05-cv-11045-GAO	Document 8	Filed 08/17/2005	Page 2 of 2
AO 440 (Rev. 10/93) Summons in a Civil Action	A PROCE DAGE	DICT COURT	
UNITED STA	ATES DIST District of	RICT COURT MASSA	CHUSETTS
MICHAEL BAEZ Plaintiff V.		SUMMONS IN A	
MICHAEL MALONEY, ET AL. Defendants	CASE	C.A. 05-110	45-GAO
TO: (Name and address of Defendant)			
ROBERT LASHUA, LT. PO BOX ECCO	64		
MICHAEL BAEZ, PRO SE MCI CECTAR JUNCTION TO BOX 100 So. Walpole, MA 02071-010 * or answer as otherwise required by the Fed		Procedure.	
an answer to the complaint which is herewith a summons upon you, exclusive of the day of ser you for the relief demanded in the complaint. a reasonable period of time after service.	vice. If you fail to	o do so, judgment by d	
SARAH ALLISON THORNTON CLERK Relecce. Sund (By) DEPUTY CLERK	DATE	127105	OF MASSINGHIS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

MICHAEL BAEZ, Plaintiff.

V.

Civil Action No. 05-11045-GAO

MICHAEL MALONEY, ET AL., Defendants

ORDER ON APPLICATION TO PROCEED WITHOUT PREPAYMENT OF FEES

Now before the Court is plaintiff's Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Affidavit:

FINDINGS The Court finds the following: Is plaintiff a "prisoner" as defined in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(h)? Α. \boxtimes Nο Yes B. Is a filing fee, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b), to be assessed at this time? 1. Yes 🗆 Plaintiff is obligated to pay the statutory filing fee immediately. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). (\$250.00 for a civil action or \$255.00 for a notice of appeal). 2. Yes 🖾 An initial partial filing fee of **\$.80** is assessed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). The remainder of the fee \$249.20 is to be assessed in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). 3. Yes \square Plaintiff has proffered evidence of being without funds for six months and being currently without funds. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2), plaintiff is assessed an obligation to make monthly payments of 20 percent of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's account each time it exceeds \$10.00 towards the payment of the \$250.00 filing fee. 4. No □ Plaintiff is not assessed a filing fee at this time.

C.		screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and/or 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, which, of the following findings does the court make?						
	1.			ch relief	e complaint is frivolous, malicious, or fails may be granted? the claims against defendant(s)			
	2.			mune f	e complaint seeks relief from a defendant rom such relief? the claims against defendant(s)			
	3.	42 U.S.C. §	1997e, Sec. 7	7(g)(2):				
					ndant to reply to a complaint if it [the indicate it reasonable opportunity to prevail on the			
		pleading red that the plai	quirements for ntiff has a rea	stating sonable	at the complaint is sufficient to satisfy the a cognizable claim and, second, found opportunity to prevail on the merits on laint against one or more defendants?			
		a. Yes 🛘	The court ha	as so de	etermined and found as to defendant(s)			
		b. No 🗆	not satisfy p	leading st	nas determined that the complaint does requirements for stating a cognizable U the defendant(s)			
		c. No 🗆	plaintiff will p	orevail o	nas determined that the likelihood that on the merits falls short of the unity" standard of the statute, as to			
			☐ all defen	dants	the defendant(s)			

	d. Ca	nnot sa	ay									
				on the		estio					etermina as to the	
			⊠ all	defen	dants		the de	fendan	ıt(s)			
					ORDE	RS						
Based	I upon the fore	egoing	, it is O	RDER	ED:							
1.	May the appl	ication Yes	to pro∈	ceed v No	vithout	prep	aymen	t of fee	s be G	3RAN	TED?	
2.	If a finding is subject to ea		dificatio		raph B	abov	e, is it	a provi	sional	findin	ig that is	5
	If the above a days of the day	ate of stater ving eliment of court w	this Ore nent signity gibility as muc ill cons	der, ei gned b to proc ch as f	ther a copy plain beed in cound ir	certifi tiff u this n par	ied cop nder th action agraph	by of his ne pains withou n B abo	s/her p s and p t paying ve to b	orison penalt ng a fil be ass	trust ties of ling fee sessed t	or the
3.	Is it FURTHE clerk send a											he
4.	Is it FURTHE Marshal serv the plaintiff w	e a co _l	py of th	ne com of servi	plaint,	sum e ad	mons, vanced	and thi I by the	s orde Unite	r as d	lirected	
						only a	as to d	efenda	nts			
5.	Is it FURTHE	R ORI No	DEREC	_	□□ a	s to a	all defe		3	in thi	s action	?
					Page:	3						

6.	a.	Although defendant(s) may not have been served with a summons and complaint, are the defendant(s) invited but not required to file an answer to aid the court in reaching a prompt final disposition on the merits?									
		No □	Yes ⊠⊠ as to all defendants								
			☐ only as to defendant(s)								
	OR										
	b.	If the defendant(s) have been served with a summons and complaint, are the defendant(s) required to reply within the time specified in the summons?									
		No 🗆	Yes ⊠⊠ as to all defendants								
			☐ only as to defendants								
Date	d: June	e 24, 2005	/s/ George A. O'Toole GEORGE A. O'TOOLE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE								

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

MICHAEL BAEZ, Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 05-11045-GAO

MICHAEL MALONEY, ET AL., Defendants

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

O'TOOLE, D.J.

In his Complaint, Plaintiff has requested appointment of counsel. This request for appointment of counsel is denied without prejudice.

It is well settled that the decision to appoint counsel is discretionary, and neither a civil litigant nor a habeas petitioner has a constitutional or statutory right to appointed counsel.

Dellenbach v. Hanks, 76 F.3d 820, 823 (7th Cir. 1996), cert. denied. 519 U.S. 894 (1996);

Jackson v. Coalter, 337 F.3d 74 (1st Cir. 2003)(state prisoner had no right to counsel to collaterally attack sentence). In order to qualify for appointment of counsel, a party must be indigent and exceptional circumstances must exist such that the denial of counsel will result in fundamental unfairness impinging on the party's due process rights. See DesRosiers v. Moran, 949 F. 2d 15, 23 (1st Cir. 1991). See also Manisy v. Maloney, 283 F. Supp. 2d 307, 317 (D. Mass. 2003)(Memorandum and Order on Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Dein, adopted (on the denial of counsel issue) by Judge Stearns by Memorandum and Order (#32) dated September 4, 2003 in C.A. 01-11849-RGS). In determining whether there are exceptional circumstances sufficient to warrant the appointment of counsel, a court must examine the total situation, focusing on the merits of the case, the complexity of the legal issues, and the litigant's

Case 1:05-cv-11045-GAO Document 8-2 Filed 08/17/2005 Page 6 of 6

ability to represent himself. DesRosiers, 949 F. 2d at 23-24 (citations omitted).

While the Court finds that the Plaintiff in this action has demonstrated that he is without sufficient funds to retain counsel, he has not yet demonstrated the kind of "exceptional circumstances" that warrant appointment of counsel in this action. Petitioner merely requests "a law firm be appointed" but does not provide any facts whatsoever to justify a *pro bono* appointment of counsel. There is no indication here that the Plaintiff is unable to represent himself competently due to lack of mental capacity or lack of understanding of the English language. In fact, Petitioner's pleadings to date appear to be well-organized and coherent, suggesting a proficiency in the English language and at least some familiarity with legal terms and prison law. The mere fact that he is a prisoner and is proceeding *pro se* is insufficient to call for appointment of counsel, because such assertions essentially could be made by any prisoner litigant. Further, Petitioner has not shown that this case raises novel or complex issues of law.

Absent such indications, appointment is not warranted at this time, and the request is Denied.

The denial of the request, however, is without prejudice to renew after the Defendants have filed a response to the Complaint. If the Plaintiff wishes to renew his request, he must file a "Motion for Appointment of Counsel" setting forth the exceptional circumstances which he alleges exist in this case which would support the motion.

Dated: June 24, 2005 /s/ George A. O'Toole

GEORGE A. O'TOOLE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE